

April 24, 2017

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Patricia Ramage  
Legal Counsel  
Manitoba Hydro  
22 – 360 Portage Avenue  
Winnipeg, MB R3C 0G8

Dear Ms. Ramage:

**Re: Intervener Proposed Minimum Filing Requirements (“MFR”), and  
Additional PUB MFRs from Order in Council 92/2017**

---

**Intervener Proposed Minimum Filing Requirements:**

In the Public Utilities Board’s (“Board”) March 31, 2017 letter, past Interveners of record were asked to review the Board’s MFRs and propose any additional MFRs and forward them to the Board for approval. This should occur prior to Manitoba Hydro preparing responses to the MFRs which would be included in its General Rate Application (“GRA”) filing. The Board considers that the time available before Manitoba Hydro’s GRA filing can be efficiently utilized to include responses to certain MFRs.

Green Action Centre (“GAC”), Consumer Coalition (“CC”), Manitoba Industrial Power Users Group (“MIPUG”) and Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak (“MKO”) have proposed additional MFRs and Manitoba Hydro has provided its written response to the proposed MFRs.

In its April 12, 2017 correspondence to the Board and prior Interveners, Manitoba Hydro confirms its intention to include updated responses and information to most of the PUB’s March 31, 2017 MFRs. However, Manitoba Hydro also cautions that certain of the proposed Intervener MFRs may be premature in that the scope of the upcoming GRA will only be determined at the Pre Hearing Conference (“PHC”). Should the topics proposed in the Intervener MFRs be determined at the PHC to be in-scope, then Manitoba Hydro indicates the proposed MFRs should be properly advanced thereafter as written Information Requests (“IRs”).

### Green Action Centre's Proposed MFRs:

GAC's proposed MFRs relate to rate design and bill affordability matters. Manitoba Hydro opposes GAC's requests indicating they may be premature and should be re-evaluated after GAC has reviewed MH's proposals and, if required, be resubmitted in the form of IRs.

Manitoba Hydro further elaborates in its April 12, 2017 letter, suggesting that implementation of conservation rates and time-of-use rates will have the impact of negatively affecting certain customer groups while benefitting others. Manitoba Hydro notes that conservation rates may amplify the negative rate increases on certain low-income customers.

The Board believes Manitoba Hydro is confusing the issue of whether its GRA filing is to include rate design proposals that the Utility indicated would be included in its next GRA with the issue of whether or not the PUB will determine such issues to be within the scope of the GRA following the PHC.

GAC has recounted some of the history, back to PUB Order 7/03, regarding rate design issues. Recently and as noted in Order 26/16, it was Manitoba Hydro that requested rate rebalancing and rate design considerations (including industrial time-of-use and residential conservation rates) not be included in the PUB's 2016 Cost of Service Study Methodology Review hearing, but rather be deferred to Manitoba Hydro's next GRA. The GAC proposed MFRs relate directly to Manitoba Hydro's next GRA. The GRA that Manitoba Hydro anticipates will be filed in May of 2017 is the "next GRA".

The Board will therefore require Manitoba Hydro to include in its GRA filing the Utility's proposals and supporting materials for the rate-related matters (rate rebalancing, time-of-use rates, and conservation rates) identified in the Board's January 22, 2016 letter and as cited in Order 26/16.

Until Manitoba Hydro's rate-related proposals and supporting materials are filed in the GRA materials, the Board is unable to determine whether GAC's proposed MFRs are duplicitous or premature. Similarly, the Board expects that the Bill Affordability Working Group materials and final Report, all to be filed in the GRA, may have considered and will contain many of the additional items GAC is requesting.

The Board therefore will not require Manitoba Hydro to provide responses to GAC's proposed MFRs in the Utility's GRA filing at this time but will expect GAC to revisit its information requests with Manitoba Hydro and the Board at the PHC.

### Consumer Coalition Proposed MFRs.

The CC seeks to expand the information sought by the PUB in its MFRs. This includes requiring comparisons of Manitoba Hydro's latest Integrated Financial Forecast ("IFF") with IFF14 which underpinned Manitoba Hydro's last full rate approval. Manitoba Hydro's objection is centred on IFF14 not being fully IFRS compliant.

The Board finds that Manitoba Hydro's full responses to CC's proposed MFRs are to be included in the GRA filing. Manitoba Hydro is at liberty in its responses to explain the specifics of the requested IFF comparisons and the impacts of IFRS on those comparisons.

#### Manitoba Industrial Power Users Group proposed MFRs.

MIPUG's proposed MFRs are supported with its written justifications. Manitoba Hydro indicates it is seeking Berkeley Research Group's consent to publicly file a Report and that further analysis of the information should await the filing of the Report.

The Board finds MIPUG's MFRs appear to relate to matters that Manitoba Hydro has indicated will be included as major topics and issues in the GRA. Providing responses to the MIPUG MFRs in Manitoba Hydro's GRA filing will be an efficient use of time and resources. Manitoba Hydro is therefore directed to include responses to MIPUG's MFRs in the Utility's GRA filing.

#### Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak proposed MFRs.

MKO's proposed MFRs are of two types: the first relate to aspects of the diesel community and the second relate to the quantification and impact of components of Manitoba Hydro rates as charged to MKO ratepayers.

Manitoba Hydro opposes MKO's proposed MFRs related to the diesel communities until MKO files the tentative Settlement Agreement that dates back to 2004. Additionally, Manitoba Hydro indicates MKO proposed MFRs that seek information broken down to a level to demonstrate the impact specifically on MKO customers. This is information that the Utility does not maintain as MKO ratepayers do not form a separate rate class. Manitoba Hydro suggests such analysis would be information sought through the IR process.

In Order 18/15, following the PHC for Manitoba Hydro's 2014/15 and 2015/16 GRA, MKO was approved to intervene on certain issues, including:

- *The finalization of Diesel Rates, provided MKO has provided Manitoba Hydro and Canada with all required settlement documents ; and*
- *Bill Reduction Issues through rate mitigation measures [and DSM initiatives]. MKO indicated that it wants to revive a policy discussion as to whether separate rates should be considered for MKO members. Such separate rates would exclude Manitoba Hydro's mitigation costs and water rental fees.*

The Board finds the proposed MKO MFRs appear duplicitous to the approved scope of the last Manitoba Hydro GRA. The Board will not require Manitoba Hydro to include responses to MKO's proposed MFRs in the Utility's GRA filing. However, at the upcoming PHC, the Board will expect MKO to provide the prerequisite documents to finalize Diesel Zone rates. Additionally, and at the PHC, both MKO and Hydro are to address whether the issues now being investigated by MKO are to be considered within the scope of the GRA.

### **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements:**

Since the Board's March 31, 2017 correspondence and MFRs to Manitoba Hydro (both which were copied prior Interveners), Order in Council 92/2017 has been issued. That Order in Council assigns the Board with the duty of considering Manitoba Hydro's capital expenditures as a factor in reaching a decision regarding electricity rates.

Order in Council 92/2017 also details the documents and the types of documents that Manitoba Hydro shall provide to the Board. To further assist Manitoba Hydro in providing additional information related to its capital expenditures, attached to this letter are additional PUB MFRs.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing determinations by the Board, Manitoba Hydro is to file complete responses to the Board's directives, additional Board MFRs and indicated Intervener MFRs in Manitoba Hydro's GRA filing. For ease of reference, Manitoba Hydro is to use and insert headings and sub-headings to identify the content of the MFR responses.

Yours truly,

*"Original Signed By:"*

Kurt Simonsen  
Associate Secretary

KS/dv

cc: All Interveners of Past Record (per attached list)  
Bob Peters, Board Counsel  
Dayna Steinfeld, Board Counsel  
Odette Fernandes, Manitoba Hydro  
Greg Barnlund, Manitoba Hydro  
Shannon Gregorashuk, Manitoba Hydro

## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

### **General Capital**

100. Update the response to Order 1176/06 Directive 6 by providing a detailed discussion, information, and support with respect to Manitoba Hydro's accounting policies related to capitalization and deferral of expenses, including planning studies, DSM costs, capitalization of overheads, mitigation costs, and accounting for plant costs related to uneconomic generation with limited expected remaining life. Indicate how the policies have changed since the introduction of IFRS.

101. Provide a detailed explanation of the process followed for initiating and managing a capital order activity and describe with illustrative calculations on how overhead and interest is applied to specific major and base capital projects.

102. Provide a breakdown of capitalized electric costs by cost element included in capital order activities and overhead interest for the last five fiscal years and for each year of the IFF.

103. Provide a detailed explanation of how a project is removed from CWIP and placed into service and indicate the impact on depreciation and finance expense during that period.

104. Provide a detailed explanation of Manitoba Hydro's impairment criteria and a breakdown of any impairments by each major project over the last five years.

### **Sustaining and Major Capital**

105. Provide a description of the processes for project approval, both Manitoba Hydro's internal approval process as well as the process for obtaining the Provincial government's approval, for base, major, and major new capital projects. Explain any changes that have occurred in these processes since 2003.

106. Provide a description of Manitoba Hydro's risk assessment and risk management processes that inform the prioritization for base and major capital expenditures.

107. Provide a description of how Manitoba Hydro relates capital expenditures to reliability and performance metrics for the generation, transmission, and distribution systems.

108. Provide a description of Manitoba Hydro's cost estimating processes for base, major, and major new capital projects.

109. Provide a description of Manitoba Hydro's tendering processes for base, major, and major new capital projects. Explain how maximum value is obtained and any other considerations in the contractor selection process such as preference for local contractors.

110. Provide a description of Manitoba Hydro's materials procurement processes for base, major, and major new capital projects. Explain how maximum value is obtained and any other considerations such as local sourcing.

111. Provide an explanation of how payments are made to contractors including identifying the levels of authority that authorize the payments for base, major, and major new capital projects.

## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

112. Provide an explanation of Manitoba Hydro's quality assurance and quality control processes for base, major, and major new capital projects.

113. Provide a description of Manitoba Hydro's project management systems used for base, major, and major new capital projects, including processes for project cost and schedule control, explaining what is done by whom as well as the internal controls and approvals.

114. For each type of project (base/major/major new), provide Manitoba Hydro's documented policies with respect to:

- i. Cost estimating
- ii. Tendering
- iii. Materials purchasing
- iv. Contractor payment
- v. Quality assurance and quality control
- vi. Project management

115. For each capital project proposed for the test year with a total cost in excess of \$15 million provide:

- i. Justification (technical and economic) for the proposed expenditures.
- ii. Explanations of why each project must be initiated or completed in the test year(s) as opposed to deferring to a future date.
- iii. Alternatives to each project, including a "do nothing" alternative, with corresponding costs, benefits or avoided costs, and risks identified.
- iv. Documentation to support the estimated costs (invoices, quotes, tenders, consultant reports) for initial cost estimates, cost estimate revisions, or cost overruns.
- v. the risk analyses that demonstrate why the project must be completed or initiated in the test year.
- vi. the asset condition assessment for the assets being replaced or supplemented.

116. For the following projects listed in the response to Order 73/15 Directive 15, provide the economic justification, including any NPV, IRR, and revenue requirement analyses completed by Manitoba Hydro that demonstrates that each project is in the interest of ratepayers:

- i. Generation Operations Remote Control & Monitoring
- ii. Laurie River and Churchill River Diversion Communications
- iii. Great Falls Stator Frame Spare
- iv. HVDC Transformer Replacement Program
- v. Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) Phase 2

## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

- vi. Fleet Services Relocation to Rosser Station
- vii. Rural Consolidation
- viii. Rosser Site Development

117. Please identify any changes in the Gillam Redevelopment and Expansion project since the PUB's recommendation to cease development of Conawapa.

118. Please confirm whether Manitoba Hydro participates in the CEA's analytics committees:

- Generation ERIS Committee
- Transmission ERIS and Bulk Electricity System (BES) Committee
- Service Continuity Committee

119. Confirm whether Manitoba Hydro obtains and makes use of CEA's analytics reports related to forced outages and service continuity.

120. Explain whether and how Manitoba Hydro incorporates the ISO 55000 series of standards for Asset Investment Planning and Management with respect to its generation, transmission, and distribution assets.

121. Explain whether and how Manitoba Hydro incorporates PAS55 standard for asset management with respect to its generation, transmission, and distribution assets.

### **Keeyask**

122. Provide a description outlining the reasons for the increased Keeyask budget of \$8.7 billion and explain what Manitoba Hydro is doing to ensure the project is completed according to the revised budget and schedule.

123. Provide a breakdown of the revised \$8.7 billion cost estimate including reserves, contingencies, escalation, interest, and major contract costs.

124. Provide a description of the overall Keeyask project management framework including processes for controlling schedules and project costs. Explain the involvement of the First Nations partnership in the project management systems including decision-making, budget approval, and contractor selection.

125. Explain the roles and processes of Manitoba Hydro's internal auditors with respect to the Keeyask project and the First Nations partnership.

126. Provide a description of the tendering and contractor selection processes for the Keeyask project including the roles, responsibilities, and authority of Manitoba Hydro and the First Nations partnership.

127. Explain the process of authorizing payments and making payments to contractors, including identifying the positions within Manitoba Hydro and the First Nations partnership that authorize payments.

128. Explain Manitoba Hydro's processes for managing risks to the cost and schedule of Keeyask.

## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

129.
  - a) Provide the Keeyask Project Risk Registry detailing the risks to the Keeyask project and Manitoba Hydro's mitigation actions [provided at NFAT]
  - b) Identify and explain whether any of the risks in the Registry with an impact score of Very High have materialized, how Manitoba Hydro addressed the risks, and what the impact of the risk has been and is expected to be on the total project cost and project schedule.
  - c) Identify whether any of the risks in the Registry with impact scores other than Very High have materialized but which have had a financial impact of greater than \$20 million or a schedule impact of greater than 6 months. Explain how Manitoba Hydro attempted to mitigate the risks, and what Manitoba Hydro has done or continues to do to manage the impact of the risk.
130. Provide the KGS Acres 2009 Basis of Cost Estimate report for Keeyask [provided at NFAT].
131. Provide the Keeyask Tender Package provided to general civil works proponents (including project schedules, contract documents (3 volumes)) [NFAT CSI Exhibit Manitoba Hydro-4].
132. Provide a list of parties to whom Manitoba Hydro provided the Keeyask general civil works tender package.
133. Provide copies of the Keeyask general civil works proposals and bids from the four bidders.
134. Provide the third party estimate report (November 2013) used in the evaluation of Keeyask general civil works bids.
135. Provide a summary table of four Keeyask general civil works proposals, engineer's estimate, and third party estimate [NFAT CSI Manitoba Hydro-3].
136. Provide any of Manitoba Hydro's reports to senior management detailing the Keeyask general civil works proposals.
137. Provide the tender package provided to Keeyask turbines and generators proponents.
138. Provide copies of the Keeyask turbines and generators proposals and bids.
139. Provide a summary table of Keeyask turbines and generators proposals as well as any estimates prepared by Manitoba Hydro or third parties.
140. Provide any of Manitoba Hydro's reports to senior management detailing the Keeyask turbines and generators proposals and bids.
141. Provide copies of the following Keeyask contracts:
  - i. Final Design Engineering
  - ii. General Civil Works
  - iii. Turbines and Generators
142. Provide a summary of the forecast contract values underpinning the \$6.5 billion Keeyask capital cost, actual expenditures to date, and forecast expenditure at



## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

completion. Explain all variances between the forecast contract values and the forecast expenditures at completion.

143. Explain how Manitoba Hydro calculated productivity in each of the Keeyask contracts listed in MFR#142. Provide forecast versus actual productivity for each contract by construction season. Explain any variances and identify measures implemented by Manitoba Hydro to mitigate the variances.

144. Contrast the productivity for each major Keeyask contract with those of each major Wuskwatim contract.

145. Provide a summary of the contingency, management reserve, and escalation reserve original budget, draw-down, remaining, and allocated amounts for the Keeyask project. Provide details of the draw-down and allocation amounts by indicating to which contract they are assigned and for what purpose. Explain how contingency, management reserve, and escalation reserve are applied.

146. Explain how escalation is applied to control and forecast at completion budgets.

147. Provide details and justification for the revised contingency, escalation, and interest of \$900 million included in the revised \$8.7 billion Keeyask project cost. Provide contingency and reserve amounts for P50, P90, and P95 probability levels.

148. Explain the mitigation initiatives identified on page 7 of the public version of the Boston Consulting Group report and what impact each will have on the capital cost of Keeyask.

149. Provide the New Generation Construction Risk Management Procedure (RSK-001) and the Project Contingency Management Procedure (RSK-002) as well as any updates made to these procedures since the NFAT.

150. Provide the Keeyask project execution plan [referenced in NFAT PUB/KP-I-34a] and any updates made to this plan.

151. Provide Manitoba Hydro internal standards and policies:

- i. Total Cost and Schedule Management (TCSM) Standard
- ii. Monitor and Control of Engineering Consultants Standard
- iii. Preparation of Project Dashboards and Trend Analysis Standard
- iv. Project Change Authorization (PCA) Process
- v. Work Package Change Management - Project Change Authorization Process
- vi. Consultant Communication Plans
- vii. Division Plan for Managing the Consultants
- viii. Engineering Work Package Scope Sheets (EWPSS)

152. Provide the Joint Keeyask Development Agreement and any amendments made to the Agreement.

## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

153. Provide a list with quantifications of any legal actions including arbitrations taken by or against Manitoba Hydro or Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership in respect of construction, procurement, or contracting associated with the Keeyask project.

### **Bipole III**

154. Provide a table of Bipole III cost estimates corresponding to each CEF beginning with CEF06 through to CEF16, broken down by Transmission Line, Converter Stations, Collector Lines, and Community Development Initiative.

155. Provide the original Capital Project Justifications (2001) and all subsequent addenda for the Transmission Line, Converter Stations, Collector Lines, Community Development Initiative, Bipole III Western Route, and Converter Upgrade to 2300 MW. Include any CPJ addenda recommended for implementation but not approved by Executive Committee or MHEB.

156. Provide the HVDC converter equipment tender package provided to proponents (including project schedules and pro forma contract documents).

157. Provide the performance guarantee specifications that the HVDC converter equipment proponents are required to meet. Provide a summary description of these specifications.

158. Provide a list of parties to whom Manitoba Hydro provided the HVDC converter equipment tender package.

159. Provide copies of the HVDC converter equipment proposals and bids from the bidders.

160. Provide any third party estimate reports used in the evaluation of HVDC converter equipment bids.

161. Provide a table comparing HVDC converter equipment proposals with any engineer's or third party estimates.

162. Provide any of Manitoba Hydro's reports to senior management detailing the HVDC converter equipment proposals.

163. Provide copies of the following contracts:

- i. HVDC Converter equipment
- ii. Keewatinohk AC Switchyard
- iii. Keewatinohk Camp Construction
- iv. Keewatinohk Camp Services
- v. Keewatinohk Site Development
- vi. Riel Synchronous Condensers

164. Provide the Rashwan Consultant report on the Bipole III cost estimate. [previously filed as CSI in 2015/16 GRA PUB/Manitoba Hydro-II-11c]

**Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

165. For every expense category related to the Bipole III project, provide a summary comparing the forecast costs underpinning the \$3.28 billion Bipole III capital cost estimate with those underpinning the \$4.65 billion control budget. Explain all variances between the two cost estimates.
166. For every contract related to the construction of Bipole III, provide a summary of the forecast contract values underpinning the \$4.65 billion Bipole III capital cost, actual expenditures to date, and forecast expenditure at completion. Explain all variances between the forecast contract values and the forecast expenditures at completion.
167. Provide a summary of the Bipole III contingency, management reserve, and escalation reserve original budget, draw-down, remaining, and allocated amounts. Provide details of the draw-down and allocation amounts by indicating to which contract they are assigned and for what purpose.
168. Provide details and justification for any revised contingency, escalation, and interest amounts included in the revised \$5 billion Bipole III project cost. Provide contingency and reserve amounts for P50, P90, and P95 probability levels.
169. a) If Manitoba Hydro developed one, provide the risk registry for the Bipole III Project detailing the risks to the Bipole III project and Manitoba Hydro's mitigation actions.
- b) Identify and explain whether any of the risks in the registry with an impact score of Very High have materialized, how Manitoba Hydro addressed the risks, and what the impact of the risk has been and is expected to be on the total project cost and project schedule.
- c) Identify whether any of the risks in the registry with impact scores other than Very High have materialized but which have had a financial impact of greater than \$20 million or a schedule impact of greater than 6 months. Explain how Manitoba Hydro attempted to mitigate the risks, and what Manitoba Hydro has done or continues to do to manage the impact of the risk.
170. Identify which CEF Bipole III forecasts (by year) assumed voltage source converter technology and confirm whether synchronous condensers were included in these project cost estimates.
171. Provide details explaining the cost impact of using line commutation converter technology instead of the voltage source converter technology.
172. Provide an explanation for why Manitoba Hydro based its HVDC converter equipment cost estimates on voltage source converter technology and not line commutation converter technology, considering tender proponents were given the freedom to offer either.
173. Provide the cost increase resulting from the decision to uprate the HVDC converter equipment to 2300 MW.
174. Provide the Bipole III project cost increases due to 1) interest and 2) escalation as a result of the change in in-service date from October 2017 to July 2018.

## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

175. Identify the number of towers of each type (guyed, free-standing, corner) included in the CEF10 (\$2.2 billion), CEF12 (\$3.28 billion), and CEF14 (\$4.65 billion) Bipole III cost estimates. Provide the changes in each of the cost estimates resulting from changes in the numbers of towers.
176. Identify the length of HVDC conductor included in the CEF10 (\$2.2 billion), CEF12 (\$3.28 billion), and CEF14 (\$4.65 billion) Bipole III cost estimates. Provide the changes in each of the cost estimates resulting from changes in the conductor length.
177. Provide the land and land rights acquisition costs included in the CEF10 (\$2.2 billion), CEF12 (\$3.28 billion), and CEF14 (\$4.65 billion) Bipole III cost estimates.
178. Identify the environmental and regulatory licence conditions and the corresponding costs for each that are incorporated into the CEF14 (\$4.65 billion) Bipole III cost estimate.
179. Explain the mitigation initiatives identified on page 7 of the public version of the Boston Consulting Group report and what impact each will have on the capital cost of Bipole III.
180. Provide a list with quantifications of any legal actions including arbitrations taken by or against Manitoba Hydro in respect of land or land rights acquisition, construction, procurement, or contracting associated with the Bipole III project.

### **Manitoba-Minnesota Transmission Project**

181. Provide the Capital Project Justification for the MMTP and any addenda.
182. Provide descriptions of the methodology used to prepare the previous (2013-2014) MMTP cost estimate and the methodology used to prepare the current MMTP cost estimate.
183. For the MMTP, provide copies of any tenders or requests for proposals related to:
  - i. transmission line construction
  - ii. station upgrades
  - iii. tower procurement
  - iv. tower foundation procurement
  - v. transformer procurement
184. Provide an explanation for the increase in capital costs between the previous MMTP cost estimate (\$353 million) and the current estimate.
185. Provide the costs included in the previous MMTP cost estimate (\$353 million) and the current estimate related to:
  - licensing and permitting
  - land and land rights acquisition
  - tower procurement

## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

- tower foundation procurement
- conductor procurement
- tower assembly
- conductor stringing
- station equipment procurement
- station equipment installation
- contingency
- reserves

### **Great Northern Transmission Line**

186. Provide the Capital Project Justification for the GNTL and any addenda.
187. Provide updates to NFAT Exhibits Manitoba Hydro-139 (items 1-4) and Manitoba Hydro-168 related to the GNTL capital and operating cost responsibilities of Manitoba Hydro and Minnesota Power.
188. Provide the GNTL facilities construction agreement between Manitoba Hydro or its subsidiary and Minnesota Power.
189. Provide the GNTL project development agreement between Manitoba Hydro or its subsidiary and Minnesota Power.
190. Provide the description of the oversight role of Manitoba Hydro prior to and during the construction of GNTL.
191. Provide a description of how Minnesota Power's cost estimating and project management methodologies for GNTL and compare and contrast these with Manitoba Hydro's methodologies. Identify whether any changes were made by Minnesota Power in their cost estimating methodology used to prepare the previous GNTL cost estimate and the methodology used to prepare the current GNTL cost estimate.
192. For the GNTL, provide copies of any tenders or requests for proposals related to:
- station equipment procurement
  - installation of station upgrades
  - tower procurement
  - tower foundation procurement
  - transmission line construction
193. Provide an explanation and breakdown for the increase in capital costs between the previous and current estimates for GNTL.
194. Provide an update on Manitoba Hydro's efforts to find another party (other than Minnesota Power) to invest in GNTL (in order to reduce Manitoba Hydro's funding obligations).

## **Additional PUB Minimum Filing Requirements for Capital Expenditure Review**

### **Manitoba-Saskatchewan Transmission Project**

195. Provide the Capital Project Justification for the MB-SK Transmission Project including addenda.
196. Provide the economic justification, including NPV, IRR, and revenue requirement analyses, that demonstrates that the MB-SK Transmission Project is favourable to ratepayers.
197. Provide the SaskPower 25MW and 100MW power sale contracts.
198. Provide the forecasted annual revenues for each of the SaskPower 25MW and 100MW contracts segregated by firm (for which Manitoba Hydro has an obligation to supply and SaskPower has an obligation to purchase) energy, firm capacity, and surplus revenues.